

Application No. 10/065,217
Docket No. 17MY-7239
Amendment dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2006

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-20 of the above-identified US Patent Application, with the result that claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,810,467 to Wood et al. (Wood), claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,039,330 to Shaw, and claims 1-10 were provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-10 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/065,225 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,014,723) to Beck et al. (Beck). In response, Applicants have amended the claims as set forth above. More particularly:

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium and the aluminum content corresponding to Alloys 5, 6, and 7 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Dependent claim 2, which depends from claim 1, has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium, the aluminum content, and the tantalum content corresponding to Alloy 5 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Dependent claim 3, which depends from claim 1, has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium, the aluminum content, and the tantalum content corresponding to Alloy 6 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Application No. 10/065,217
Docket No. 17MY-7239
Amendment dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2006

Dependent claims 5 and 6 have been amended to depend from claim 3 instead of claim 1.

Dependent claim 7, which depends from claim 1, has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium, the aluminum content, and the tantalum content corresponding to Alloy 7 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to recite the compositional ranges corresponding to Alloys 6 and 7 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Application No. 10/065,217
Docket No. 17MY-7239
Amendment dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2006

Independent claim 11 has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium and the aluminum content corresponding to Alloys 1, 2, and 3 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Dependent claim 12, which depends from claim 11, has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium and the aluminum content corresponding to Alloy 1 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Dependent claim 13, which depends from claim 11, has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium and the aluminum content corresponding to Alloy 2 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Dependent claims 15 and 16 have been amended to depend from claim 13 instead of claim 11.

Dependent claim 17, which depends from claim 1, has been amended to recite the sum of aluminum and titanium and the aluminum content corresponding to Alloy 3 of Table I of Applicants' specification.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to recite the compositional ranges corresponding to Alloys 1 and 3 of Table I of Applicants' specification.


Applicants believe that the above amendments do not present new matter, and that the claims more particularly recite Alloys 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, which Applicants believe are not obvious over the prior art references of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 are

Application No. 10/065,217
Docket No. 17MY-7239
Amendment dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2006

respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter
now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Gary M. Hartman
Reg. No. 33,898

May 8, 2006
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
TEL.: (219) 462-4999
FAX: (219) 464-1166